

PROPOSITION

64

LIMITS ON PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF UNFAIR BUSINESS COMPETITION LAWS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

Prepared by the Attorney General

Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. Initiative Statute.

- Limits individual's right to sue by allowing private enforcement of unfair business competition laws only if that individual was actually injured by, and suffered financial/property loss because of, an unfair business practice.
- Requires private representative claims to comply with procedural requirements applicable to class action lawsuits.
- Authorizes only the California Attorney General or local government prosecutors to sue on behalf of general public to enforce unfair business competition laws.
- Limits use of monetary penalties recovered by Attorney General or local government prosecutors to enforcement of consumer protection laws.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- Unknown state costs or savings depending on whether the measure significantly increases or decreases court workload related to unfair competition lawsuits and the extent to which funds diverted by this measure are replaced.
- Unknown potential costs to local governments depending on the extent to which funds diverted by this measure are replaced.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

BACKGROUND

California's unfair competition law prohibits any person from engaging in any unlawful or fraudulent business act. This law may be enforced in court by the Attorney General, local public prosecutors, or a person acting in the interest of itself, its members, or the public. Examples of this type of lawsuit include cases involving deceptive or misleading advertising or violations of state law intended to protect the public well-being, such as health and safety requirements.

Currently, a person initiating a lawsuit under the unfair competition law is not required to show that he/she suffered injury or lost money or property. Also, the Attorney General and local public prosecutors can bring an unfair competition lawsuit without demonstrating an injury or the loss of money or property of a claimant.

Currently, persons initiating unfair competition lawsuits do not have to meet the requirements for class action lawsuits. Requirements for a class action lawsuit include (1) certification by the court

of a group of individuals as a class of persons with a common interest, (2) demonstration that there is a benefit to the parties of the lawsuit and the court from having a single case, and (3) notification of all potential members of the class.

In cases brought by the Attorney General or local public prosecutors, violators of the unfair competition law may be required to pay civil penalties up to \$2,500 per violation. Currently, state and local governments may use the revenue from such civil penalties for general purposes.

PROPOSAL

This measure makes the following changes to the current unfair competition law:

- ***Restricts Who Can Bring Unfair Competition Lawsuits.*** This measure prohibits any person, other than the Attorney General and local public prosecutors, from bringing a lawsuit for unfair competition unless the person has suffered injury and lost money or property.

LIMITS ON PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF UNFAIR BUSINESS COMPETITION LAWS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

PROP

64

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

- ***Requires Lawsuits Brought on Behalf of Others to Be Class Actions.*** This measure requires that unfair competition lawsuits initiated by any person, other than the Attorney General and local public prosecutors, on behalf of others, meet the additional requirements of class action lawsuits.
- ***Restricts the Use of Civil Penalty Revenues.*** This measure requires that civil penalty revenues received by state and local governments from the violation of unfair competition law be used only by the Attorney General and local public prosecutors for the enforcement of consumer protection laws.

FISCAL EFFECTS

State Government

Trial Courts. This measure would have an unknown fiscal impact on state support for local trial courts. This effect would depend primarily on whether the measure increases or decreases the overall level of court workload dedicated to unfair competition cases. If the level of court workload significantly decreases because of the proposed restrictions on unfair competition lawsuits, there could be state savings. Alternatively, this measure could increase court workload, and therefore state costs, to the extent there is an increase in class action lawsuits and their related requirements. The number of cases that would be affected by this measure and the corresponding state costs or savings for support of local trial courts is unknown.

Revenues. This measure requires that certain state civil penalty revenue be diverted from general state purposes to the Attorney General for enforcement of consumer protection laws. To the extent that this diverted revenue is replaced by the General Fund, there would be a state cost. However, there is no provision in the measure requiring such replacement.

Local Government

The measure requires that local government civil penalty revenue be diverted from general local purposes to local public prosecutors for enforcement of consumer protection laws. To the extent that this diverted revenue is replaced by local general fund monies, there would be a cost to local government. However, there is no provision in the measure requiring the replacement of diverted revenues.

Other Effects on State and Local Government Costs

The measure could result in other less direct, unknown fiscal effects on the state and localities. For example, this measure could result in increased workload and costs to the Attorney General and local public prosecutors to the extent that they pursue certain unfair competition cases that other persons are precluded from bringing under this measure. These costs would be offset to some unknown extent by civil penalty revenue earmarked by the measure for the enforcement of consumer protection laws.

Also, to the extent the measure reduces business costs associated with unfair competition lawsuits, it may improve firms' profitability and eventually encourage additional economic activity, thereby increasing state and local revenues. Alternatively, there could be increased state and local government costs. This could occur to the extent that future lawsuits that would have been brought under current law by a person on behalf of others involving, for example, violations of health and safety requirements, are not brought by the Attorney General or a public prosecutor. In this instance, to the extent that violations of health and safety requirements are not corrected, government could potentially incur increased costs in health-related programs.